



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,627	08/05/2003	Steven C. Robertson	ROBERT.P00D1	7205
7590 01/31/2007 Patrick M. Dwyer 1818 Westlake Avenue N, Suite 114 Seattle, WA 98109			EXAMINER ROSEN, NICHOLAS D	
			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			01/31/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,627

Applicant(s)

ROBERTSON, STEVEN C.

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-37 and 39-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 29-47 have been examined.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

#### **Claims 29-37 and 39-45**

Claims 29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") in view of official notice. As per claim 29, Cohen discloses a method of providing a gift registry service over a distributed network of computers, the method comprising the following steps: (b) a gift registrant accessing goods or services online from a plurality of goods or service provider (SP) sites, and registering a gift selection from one or more, potentially each, of the plurality of goods or service provider sites into a gift registrant wish list; (c) storing the wish list into a wish list data memory structure accessible to at least one gift registry site; and (d) a gift purchaser accessing the stored wish list from a site on the distributed network (first three paragraphs). Cohen does not expressly disclose (a) running a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site, but official notice is taken that running applications on computers is well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to run

Art Unit: 3625

a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site, for the obvious advantage of enabling the online sites disclosed by Cohen to carry out their disclosed functions.

Cohen does not expressly disclose that the gift purchaser accesses the stored wish list from a site remote from any gift registry sites, but official notice is taken that it is well known to access online web sites from remote sites, that being one of the beauties of the World Wide Web. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the access to be remote, for the stated advantage of not having to trudge around crowded department stores and wait in line to buy gifts on a couple's wedding registry.

As per claim 32, Cohen discloses a "couple's personalized 'Our Wedding' page" (second paragraph), implying that the gift registrant has registered an occasion and associated at least one wish list with the occasion, the occasion data and the association(s) being stored in an occasion data memory structure accessible to the gift registry site. Cohen does not disclose whether the gift registrant has registered an occasion before or after (b) accessing goods or services online from provider sites, and registering gift selections. The result would be the same in either case, and even if the order differs from that in the system Cohen describes, changing the sequence in which ingredients are added has been held to be obvious to one of ordinary skill (*Ex Parte Rubin* 128 USPQ 440, 441-442, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, 1959), to which a change in the sequence in which steps are performed with the same results is held to be analogous.

Art Unit: 3625

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") and official notice as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of the anonymous article, "InfoGear® and Amazon.com Team up to Sell Books Via Internet Appliances," hereinafter "InfoGear." Cohen does not disclose that the gift purchaser accesses the wish list by searching for at least one criterion, but it is well known to access relevant pages, etc., by searching websites by at least one criterion, as taught, for example, by "InfoGear" (paragraph beginning, "The CIDCO iPhone's touch-screen," and in particular the sentences beginning, "The extensive Amazon.com website" and "Other features include"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the gift purchaser to access the wish list by searching for at least one criterion (e.g., searching through a list of couples to find the name(s) of the gift registrant(s), or else entering a criterion such as the gift registrant's name in an engine for searching a gift registry site), for the obvious advantage of enabling a gift purchaser to find the wish list on a site where there a multiplicity of wish lists.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") and official notice as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of the anonymous article, "Lillian Vernon Launches New Interactive Online Catalog," hereinafter "Lillian Vernon." Cohen does not disclose (e) the gift registrant creating a distribution list, the distribution list being stored in a distribution list memory data structure from the gift registry site; (f) the gift registrant requesting that the gift registrar application send notifications to members of the distribution list; and (g) the gift

Art Unit: 3625

registrar sending notifications to members of the distribution list. However, "Lillian Vernon" teaches a distribution list, evidently stored in a corresponding data structure for the disclosed features to be operative, the gift registrar sending notifications to members of the distribution list, wherein the distribution list is presumably created by the gift registrant, who also requests that notifications be sent to members of the distribution list (paragraph beginning, "Features of the new online catalog"), because otherwise it would be difficult for the gift registrar to know who the customer's "family and friends" were, what their e-mail addresses were, or what dates were special occasions; also, sending such reminders without the approval of the gift registrant could lead to embarrassment and various difficulties. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to carry out these steps, for the obvious and implied advantages of aiding gift registrants in obtaining the products they desire, and sellers in making profitable sales.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") and official notice as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of the anonymous article, "Lillian Vernon Launches New Interactive Online Catalog," hereinafter "Lillian Vernon." Claim 33 is obvious on the grounds set forth for claim 31 above.

Claims 34, 35, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel"), "Lillian Vernon," and official notice as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Lewis ("Desk: Zedcor's Septet of Applications Takes Aim at Microsoft Works"). As per claim 34, "Lillian Vernon" teaches

Art Unit: 3625

sending reminders before special occasions such as birthdays, anniversaries, and holidays (paragraph beginning, "Features of the new online catalog"), implying the gift registrant specifying an occasion reminder which is stored. "Lillian Vernon" does not disclose the gift registrant specifying an occasion reminder for repeating notifications, but it is well known to specify how an occasion reminder is to be repeated, as taught by Lewis (paragraph beginning, "Appointments. DeskSecretary reminds you"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the gift registrant to specify an occasion reminder for repeating notifications, the occasion reminder being stored in a memory structure, for the obvious advantage of arranging repeated notifications, increasing the chance that a potential gift purchaser will remember to purchase a gift.

As per claim 35, "Lillian Vernon" teaches a wish list associated to the occasion reminder, implying storing the association is a suitable memory, for the disclosed operations to be carried out (paragraph beginning, "Features of the new online catalog"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to associate a wish list to the occasion reminder, for the obvious and implied advantage of causing family and friends to purchase a wished-for item.

As per claim 36, neither Cohen nor "Lillian Vernon" expressly discloses associating an SP (merchant) site to the occasion reminder, but official notice is taken that it is well known for e-mails to include merchant or other site links associated to them. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic

Art Unit: 3625

commerce at the time of applicant's invention to associate an SP (merchant) site to the occasion reminder, for the obvious advantage of encouraging potential gift purchasers to connect to a site where gifts can be purchased.

As per claim 37, "Lillian Vernon" teaches at least one occasion trigger, presumably specified by the gift registrant, for notification of the members of an associated distribution list (friends and family notified of an approaching birthday, anniversary, or holiday; paragraph beginning, "Features of the new online catalog"); further, the gift registrar automatically sends the occasion reminder to each of the members on the tripping of an occasion trigger (the trigger being that it is three weeks before the special occasion). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to carry this out, for the obvious and implied advantage of causing members of the distribution list to make purchases.

Claims 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") and official notice as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Snyder ("Stores Battle Publishers for Online Gift Registries"). Cohen does not disclose an SP registering a sale event by sending sale event data over the network of computers to the gift registry site, the gift registry site storing the data, but Snyder teaches gift registries selling advertising on their sites (paragraph beginning, "For the online content sites"), and official notice is taken that it is well known to transmit advertising data to the site where the advertising will be posted, and also that it is well known for advertising data to comprise sale event data. Hence, it would have been



Art Unit: 3625

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for an SP to register a sale event by sending advertisement data over the network of computers to the gift registry, the gift registry site storing the data, for the obvious advantage of enabling advertising of a sale event to be displayed on the gift registry site, and the gift registry site to profit from selling advertising, as stated in Snyder.

Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel"), Snyder ("Stores Battle Publishers for Online Gift Registries") and official notice as applied to claim 39 above, and further in view of the anonymous article, "Lillian Vernon Launches New Interactive Online Catalog," hereinafter "Lillian Vernon." As per claim 40, selling advertising on a site with demographically desirable shoppers, as taught by Snyder, implies displaying the advertising, which may include sale event data, as set forth above with regard to claim 39, on the site; "Lillian Vernon" teaches a gift registrar sending out notifications (paragraph beginning, "Features of the new online catalog"), and official notice is taken that it is well known to send out notifications (e.g., e-mails) containing advertising. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the gift registrar to send out a sale event notification, for the obvious advantage of notifying potential purchasers of a sale event, making them more likely to buy.

As per claim 41, "Lillian Vernon" teaches a gift registrar sending out notifications with pertinent wish list data.

Art Unit: 3625

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") and official notice as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Vanechanos, Jr. (U.S. Patent 5,884,309). Cohen does not disclose, after step (d), the gift purchaser viewing a display of multiple SP's from whom the purchaser may purchase items on the gift registrant's wish list, but it is well known to display multiple merchant sites from which a purchaser may purchase items, as taught by Vanechanos (column 6, line 63, through column 7, line 15). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the gift purchaser viewing a display of multiple SP's, for the obvious advantage of enabling the gift purchaser to select a suitable of preferred SP.

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") and official notice as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Shilcrat (U.S. Patent 5,963,948). Cohen does not disclose, after step (d), the gift registrar application indicating the most desirable SP for an item on the gift registrant's wish list, but it is well known for cybermalls to enable users to search across multiple merchant sites to find the merchant offering desired products, or offering them cheaply, as taught, for example, by Shilcrat (column 2, lines 2-10), and providing such information is held to constitute indicating the most desirable merchant site/SP. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the gift registrar application to indicate the most desirable SP for an item on the gift registrant's wish list, for the obvious advantage of

Art Unit: 3625

assisting purchasers in finding desired products, and finding them cheaply, etc., thus encouraging use of the gift registrar site.

Claims 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") and official notice as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of LeRoy et al. (U.S. Patent 5,970,474). As per claim 44, Cohen discloses (l) the gift purchaser purchasing a gift suggested by the gift registrant's wish list (first three paragraphs). Cohen does not disclose (m) the gift registrar application storing data pertaining to the gift purchaser's purchases for a gift registrant in a purchased items data memory structure accessible to the gift registry site, but it is well known to store purchase information regarding a gift registrant in accessible memory, as taught by LeRoy (column 6, lines 59-68; column 8, lines 11-50). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to thus store the purchase information, for the stated advantage of updating a gift registry, and ensuring that the latest information is always provided to a purchasing customer desiring to purchase a gift for the registrant (e.g. avoiding duplicate presents).

As per claim 45, LeRoy teaches providing gift recommendations to prospective gift purchasers, based upon gifts previously purchased for gift registrant whose wish list the purchaser is accessing (just as above, regarding claim 44).

#### **Claim 46**

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") in view of official notice. Cohen discloses a method of providing

Art Unit: 3625

a gift registry service over a distributed network of computers, the method comprising the following steps: (b) a gift registrant accessing goods or services online from a goods or service provider (SP) site, and registering a gift selection from the goods or service provider site into a gift registrant wish list; (c) storing the wish list into a wish list data memory structure accessible to at least one gift registry site; and (d) a gift purchaser accessing the stored wish list from a site on the distributed network (first three paragraphs). Cohen does not expressly disclose (a) running a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site, but official notice is taken that running applications on computers is well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to run a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site, for the obvious advantage of enabling the online sites disclosed by Cohen to carry out their disclosed functions.

Cohen does not expressly disclose that the gift purchaser accesses the stored wish list from a site remote from any gift registry sites, but official notice is taken that it is well known to access online web sites from remote sites, that being one of the beauties of the World Wide Web. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the access to be remote, for the stated advantage of not having to trudge around crowded department stores and wait in line to buy gifts on a couple's wedding registry.

**Claim 47**

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen ("Going to the Chapel") in view of Shilcrat (U.S. Patent 5,963,948) and official notice.

Art Unit: 3625

Cohen discloses a method of providing a gift registry service over a distributed network of computers, the method comprising the following steps: (b) a gift registrant accessing goods or services online from a plurality of goods or service provider (SP) sites, and registering a gift selection from one or more, potentially each, of the plurality of goods or service provider sites into a gift registrant wish list; (c) storing the wish list into a wish list data memory structure accessible to at least one gift registry site; and (d) a gift purchaser accessing the stored wish list from a site on the distributed network (first three paragraphs). Cohen does not expressly disclose (a) running a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site, but official notice is taken that running applications on computers is well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to run a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site, for the obvious advantage of enabling the online sites disclosed by Cohen to carry out their disclosed functions.

Cohen does not expressly disclose that the gift purchaser accesses the stored wish list from a site remote from any gift registry sites, but official notice is taken that it is well known to access online web sites from remote sites, that being one of the beauties of the World Wide Web. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the access to be remote, for the stated advantage of not having to trudge around crowded department stores and wait in line to buy gifts on a couple's wedding registry.

Cohen does not disclose the gift registrar application indicating to the gift purchaser the most desirable SP for an item on the gift registrant's wish list, but it is well

Art Unit: 3625

known for cybermall to enable users to search across multiple merchant sites to find the merchant offering desired products, or offering them cheaply, as taught, for example, by Shilcrat (column 2, lines 2-10), and providing such information is held to constitute indicating the most desirable merchant site/SP. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the gift registrar application to indicate the most desirable SP for an item on the gift registrant's wish list, for the obvious advantage of assisting purchasers in finding desired products, and finding them cheaply, etc., thus encouraging use of the gift registrar site.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 38 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art of record, Cohen ("Going to the Chapel"), teaches a method of providing a gift registry service over a distributed network of computers, with many elements of claim 29. Other elements of claim 29 and its dependents, through claim 37, are taught by the anonymous article, "Lillian Vernon Launches New Interactive Online Catalog," by Lewis ("Desk: Zedcor's Septet of Applications Takes Aim at Microsoft Works"), or are officially noticed as being well known, as set forth above. However, neither Cohen nor any other prior art of record discloses after automatically

Art Unit: 3625

sending an occasion reminder to the members of an associated distribution list (e.g., friends and family of a gift registrant), a gift registrar application automatically sending an occasion notification to at least one SP (service provider, such as a merchant selling products to be given as wedding or birthday gifts) upon the tripping of an occasion trigger. It is known to take various actions upon tripping of an occasion trigger, and it is known to send data to merchants (e.g., demographic data on persons to whom the merchants may wish to advertise), but that is not specific enough to make sending such occasion notifications to at least one SP obvious, particularly not in the context of a gift registry service.

Although reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention (*In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991)), the factor that a finding of obviousness against claim 38 based on a reference regarding transmitting data to merchants would have to be combined with three explicit references and several facts of which official notice was taken further weighs against finding claim 38 obvious.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed December 26, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues against the obviousness of "running a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site," which is not expressly disclosed by Cohen. Examiner replies that Cohen discloses several online gift registries; it is only running an application (and accessing from a remote site) of which official notice was

Art Unit: 3625

taken; and running applications is very well known, and was even in 1999. If, to use Applicant's analogy, Applicant were claiming a method for purchasing milk as needed by rigging a weight sensor to determine that milk was needed, and having a computer, in response, send notification to the grocery store, the claim might well be patentable over prior art showing only that it had been known to purchase milk; however, if the primary prior art reference disclosed a weight sensor in combination with a computer that sent notification to the grocery store, and merely failed to be explicit about the computer running a milk-ordering application, the milk-ordering application could well be considered obvious, if not inherent. Examiner refers Applicant to the definition of "application" from the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary. It is not clear how the servers for the gift registry websites disclosed by Cohen could operate without running programs describable as gift registrar applications, and even if they possibly could and did, application programs are such standard features of computers that their use would have been obvious.

Next, Applicant argues that Cohen does not disclose, and actually teaches away from, element (b) of claim 29, "a gift registrant accessing goods or services from a plurality of SP sites..." Examiner replies that Cohen in fact does disclose a plurality of SP sites; in her description of The Wedding Network, she writes, "Couples select items from a list of online retailers," and in the American Bridal Registry, "You can select gifts off-line or with a provided list of traditional wedding-gift manufacturers, gift shops, wedding services, and Internet malls." (Emphasis added.)



Regarding claim 30, Applicant has requested a specific reference disclosing the feature of searching a website for at least one criterion, and within the two references a reason to combine. In response, Examiner has made the "InfoGear" article of record, correspondingly modifying the rejection of claim 30. Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, motivation is implied by the "InfoGear" article, and by knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, that people search websites by criteria to access the information they want, instead of wasting time with information of no interest to them. This "searching for at least one criterion" can take several forms: A user wishing to buy a registered gift for the Montague-Capulet wedding could enter "Montague" and/or "Capulet" as keywords for a search conducted by the website, by analogy to the teaching of "InfoGear," or he could simply look through a listing of wish lists until he spotted the names of the people for whom he wished to buy a wedding present, and click to access their wish list. Either would meet the limitation of claim 30. There may be, as Applicant writes, a multitude of ways one could navigate to a wish list, but Applicant cites no evidence that the most common, in 1999, was to use a password or login, and Cohen does not suggest any need for a password or login, nor do the other gift registry-related articles relied upon do

Art Unit: 3625

so. Finally, even if a password or login were used, that would not necessarily exclude a search by at least one criterion.

As per claim 32, Applicant argues that there is no teaching that occasion data such as dates, guest lists, and reminder schedules are stored anywhere in the system of Cohen. Examiner replies that claim 32 does not recite dates, guest lists, and reminder schedules. It merely recites registering an occasion and associating at least one wish list with the occasion. Registering an upcoming wedding and the corresponding wish list, and storing the data, as implied by the online wedding registries that Cohen discloses, would meet the claim limitations, without any need to store the date of the wedding in the registry, let alone storing guest lists and reminder schedules.

Applicant presents no particular arguments for the allowability of the remaining claims except that they are parallel to or dependent on claims 29, 30, 31, and 32. As claims 29-32 are held to be properly rejected, there is no reason to withdraw the rejections of the other claims, although the limitation of claim 38 remains potentially allowable.

The common knowledge or well-known in the art statements in the previous office action are taken to be admitted prior art, because Applicant did not traverse Examiner's taking of official notice, except with regard to claim 30. In response to Applicant's traversal, Examiner has relied upon explicit prior art to meet the limitation of claim 30.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent 6,061,660) disclose a system and method for incentive programs and award fulfillment (note column 12, lines 48-52, for searching a website by criteria). Call (U.S. Patent 6,154,738) discloses methods and apparatus for disseminating product information via the Internet using universal product codes (note column 14, line 56, through column 15, line 7, for searching a website by criteria). Hsu et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0122926) disclose a method and system for a universal gift registry.

The Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (page 27) defines "application." The anonymous article, "BarnesandNoble.com Adds NY Review of Books Readers Catalog," discloses searching a website catalog by various criteria. The anonymous article, "Scantron Quality Computers Launches eCommerce Catalog; <http://catalog.sgc.com>," discloses searching a website catalog by various criteria.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3625

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 571-273-6762.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*Nicholas D. Rosen*  
NICHOLAS D. ROSEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 26, 2007